

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of May 6, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 and 46 are pending. Claims 1, 4-8, 12-20 and 46 are rejected. Claims 2, 3 and 9-11 are objected to. Claims 1-20 and 46 remain in this application.

The Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "receiving a player input selecting one of the two response options." This is supported in the specification at page 4, paragraph 18.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite "when the first player selects said response option (a), said player input comprises an identity of a second player." This is supported in the specification at page 4, paragraph 19.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite "when the first player selects said response option (b), said player input comprises response information." This is supported in the specification at page 4, paragraph 18.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite "said response information." This is supported in the specification at page 6, paragraph 26.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite "said response information." This is supported in the specification at page 6, paragraph 26.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite "the task comprises at least one of audio and video data and, in step (iii), said response information corresponds to the audio and/or video data." This is supported in the specification at page 6, paragraph 27.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite "said response information comprises at least one of audio and video data recorded by the mobile terminal." This is supported in the specification at page 6, paragraph 27.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite "task server." This is supported in the specification at pages 3-4 paragraph 17.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite “the task comprises audio data, video data, or audio and video data and, in step (ii)(a), the task response comprises information corresponding to at least one of audio and video data.” This is supported in the specification at page 6, paragraph 27.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite “comprises the mobile terminal recording at least one of audio and video data corresponding to the task. This is supported in the specification at page 6, paragraph 27.

Claim 46 has been amended to recite “when receiving a user input via the input device indicating the user selects said response option.” This is supported in the specification at pages 3-4, paragraph 17.

The Amendments introduce no new matter.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1, 3-8, 11, and 46 are objected to because of a number of informalities. The claims have been amended to address these informalities.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 7-8 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 7-8 and 19-20 have been amended to recite “at least one of audio and video data” instead of using the ambiguous claim limitation of “and/or.” The amended claims now clearly delineate the types of data referred to in the claim.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-8, 12-20 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson *et. al.* (US 2002/0004424; hereinafter Nelson) in view of Lasko *et. al.* (US 2003/0052456; hereinafter Lasko).

The secondary reference cited in this rejection is Lasko, which has a filing date of September 14, 2001. The filing date of the present application is December 18, 2001. Applicants

submit concurrently herewith a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 establishing invention of the subject matter of the rejected claims prior to the effective date of Lasko.

With Lasko having been removed as an applicable reference, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Should the Office deem the attached Declaration insufficient, applicants reserve the right to provide additional evidence, and also to provide arguments over Lasko and/or Nelson based on the merits of each reference, and more specifically, based on deficiencies of each reference as compared to the pending claims.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Based on the aforementioned claims 1-20 and 46 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the subject application be reconsidered and passed to issue at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 12 day of July, 2004

By: 
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD/jc/mmd